

LOUISVILLE JOURNAL

PAINTED AND PUBLISHED

BY PRENTICE & HENDERSON,

Corners of Main and Fifth streets.

Daily, \$10.00. Weekly, \$6.00. Weekly, \$3.00.

Two-Weekly Journal is published on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday.

The Weekly Journal is published on Tuesday.

The Daily Journal, \$5 a year.

Evening Bulletin (city) 10 cents per week—(country) \$4 per annum, or \$10 for 3 months.

Weekly Bulletin \$1.

LOUISVILLE.

TUESDAY, MAY 17, 1853.

First Page.—Shipwrecks of the Seas: The Revolution in China; Tobacco Crop of 1852; Sailing of the Ocean Wave; Six and Half-a-Penny.

The New Tarponis Orders.—Tire Presses—Plates.—We mention a few days ago the sending of an agent by the new Secretary of the Treasury from Philadelphia or New York to St. Louis for the transportation of gold and silver between those places. The St. Louis Republican takes the following notice of the transaction:

Under the new Secretary of the Treasury the use of the Post Office is discontinued. If the government sends \$1,000 to New York, which they desire to place in New Orleans, there is no other way now than to send it by Mr. Gifford, chosen to intercept it, to the latter. Then, the Sub-Treasurer in this city receives \$1,000 in gold and \$1,000 in silver from New York, by express, and in a little while it will be carried off in some other direction. The Secretary of the Post Office has no power to do this before he is done with it, and if he should be able to do it, very likely he would give up all his other powers to do it.

We do not agree with the editor of the St. Louis Republican that it is an "obligation of the situation" which requires the execution of the law in this way. It is not an inherent construction, for it is the construction and the only one construction.

The requirements of the Sub-Treasury shall be dispensed with, and that every transfer of money shall be made by the actual handing of the gold and silver piece to place, in just as plain and obvious a manner as possible.

Mr. Van Buren's Secretary of the Treasury, the most lovable Woodbury, who held the Secretariatehip when the Sub-Treasury was adopted, saw that he could not execute the law without handing gold and silver handed whenever wanted for government purposes, and so he had the law changed to obviate the capiment of the law.

We noticed, a few days since, a little work done to the cryptopis portion of the vegetable world, and we were somewhat surprised, in examining the work, with the amount of power displayed by an author whom we had not previously heard of. But our surprise has ceased, that author has read this work of Schleiden's, and has a good memory. Schleiden evidently made a lasting impression upon it, in quite a number of his writings.

The changes made in the work, are well calculated to explain and enforce Schleiden's teaching. We should be glad to see this work introduced into the high female schools of the country. There are few female minds of taste or true refinement that do not love flowers and shrubs, and they should be taught that knowledge which is essential to the proper management of their home, is better adapted to the pursuit of pleasure than of profit.

This book is very well written, and is a valuable addition to any library.

ALPHONSE WOOD, Author of "Schems," & C.

The great West is so rapidly filling up, is greatly increasing its resources, and is changing its general features so constantly that there is a frequent necessity for new works devoted to the display of its growth and its prospects for the future. The one before us is an excellent book of its kind, but the author should not have got the great importance of an index to such a book as this. The want of one almost, if not quite, makes the failure of a work.

But it is a very useful and interesting book, and that each man, who is employed should be allowed nine-tenths of the contents of his pack for his trouble, the Secretary should have the operation performed exactly in this kind of good reading matter.

Three books may be found at the bookstore of Webb & Leverett.

The editor of the Democrat, in his paper of yesterday, says of us:

"The present structure is now revelling in the spirit of an old one, and without the leadership of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law."

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility. He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

But he was wrong—he should have either executed the law, or had it repealed, or had it suspended.

Robert J. Walker, were wrong in imitating the operation, seeing that it put the government in a position to do what was right.

He determined to dispense with that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

He was wrong—the Sub-Treasurer should have been responsible for that provision of the law upon his own responsibility.

He concluded that a provision to preposterous, a provision requiring that money should be transferred at great expense and at perpetual hazard, when it could be transferred more expeditiously without the cost of one cent and without the leadship of a man, who is both contemptible to us, and entitled to respect, to sit in judgment on us, we used transfer-drafts just as all his predecessors had done before the passage of the Sub-Treasury law.

